

## REMARKS

### INTRODUCTION:

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1 and 15-17 have been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-17 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0005865 A1 to Barbara Hayes-Roth et al. (hereinafter "Hayes-Roth"). The rejection is traversed below and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

As taught by Hayes-Roth, a single agent engine handles various input types of generated by a user. For example, Hayes-Roth describes FIG. 23 as "[a]gent engine 18... uses either authoring database 18 or run-time database 20 to generate interactive agent behavior 22" in paragraph [0388] on page 21. Although not explicit, the description in Hayes-Roth uses singular nouns to describe the components in FIG. 23 and the illustration in FIG. 23 clearly indicates a single Agent Engine 14 responding to input from either Authoring Database 18 or Run-Time Database 20. Consequently, both the description in paragraph [0388] and the illustration shown in FIG. 23 together imply a single agent engine is communicating with the authoring database or run-time database in response to all user-generated input to simulate interactive behavior.

In contrast, claim 1 recites "a dialog agent that changes a state in accordance with the input information, [and] changes acceptable input information which the dialog agent is capable of accepting in accordance with the change in the state" at lines 3-5 and

when the input information is input, the dialog control part is notified of acceptable input information indicating input information which each of the dialog agents is capable of accepting in each state from the plurality of the dialog agents, and matches the input information with the acceptable input information to selects a dialog agent capable of processing the input information

at lines 10-15. Embodiments of these recited features are described on page 18, lines 30-33 and page 19, lines 9-19 of the specification. Consequently, claim 1 as well as claims 2-14, which depend therefrom, are patentably distinguishable over Hayes-Roth, because Hayes-Roth teaches a single agent engine processing all the input information generated and not a "plurality of the dialog agents" as recited in claim 1.

Claims 15 and 16 each recites:

inquiring about acceptable input information indicating information which each of dialog agents is capable of accepting in each state with respect to a plurality of the dialog agents that change states in accordance with input information from a user, change the acceptable input information which the dialog agents are capable of accepting in accordance with the changes in the states, and make responses

(e.g., claim 15, lines 2-7) and "matching the input information with the acceptable input information to select a dialog agent capable of processing the input information, and transmitting the input information to the selected dialog agent to request a response to the input information" (e.g., claim 16, lines 9-12). For the reasons discussed above, it is submitted that claims 15 and 16 are patentably distinguishable over Hayes-Roth.

Claim 17 recites:

querying a plurality of dialog agents that change states in accordance with input information from a user, changing acceptable input information which the dialog agents are capable of accepting in accordance with the changes in the states, and making responses to determine what input parameters each of the dialog agents requires in each state and storing the input parameters

at lines 2-6 and "matching the input with the input parameters required by each dialog agent and transmitting the input when the input matches the input parameters of a dialog agent" at lines 8-9. For the reasons discussed above, it is submitted that claim 17 is patentably distinguishable over Hayes-Roth.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, that all

pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited. At a minimum, this Amendment should be entered at least for purposes of Appeal as it either clarifies and/or narrows the issues for consideration by the Board.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited and possibly concluded by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss any such remaining issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
David E. Moore  
Registration No. 59,047

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501